Exhibit 13

Page 1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 CASE NO. 18-MD-2865 (LAK) 3 IN RE: 4 CUSTOMS AND TAX ADMINISTRATION OF 5 THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK (SKATTEFORVALTNINGEN) TAX REFUND 6 SCHEME LITIGATION 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 CONFIDENTIAL 14 15 16 17 18 REMOTE VTC VIDEOTAPED EXPERT DEPOSITION UNDER ORAL 19 **EXAMINATION OF** 20 C. FREDERICK REISH 21 22 DATE: March 25, 2022 23 24 25 REPORTED BY: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN, CCR

1	C. FREDERICK REISH,
2	called as a witness, having been first
3	duly sworn according to law, testifies as follows:
4	
5	
6	
7	EXAMINATION BY MR. MAGUIRE:
8	Q Good morning, Mr. Reish?
9	A Good morning. Actually, it's
10	Reish.
11	Q Reish. I'm sorry.
12	A No problem.
13	Q So, Mr. Reish, my name is Bill
14	Maguire. I'm going to be asking you
15	questions today.
16	If any question that I ask you is
17	unclear, will you please let me know before
18	you answer the question?
19	A Yes.
20	Q That way you'll give me an
21	opportunity to clear up the question and
22	we'll all know, when you answer the question,
23	you understood the question.
24	Is that agreeable?
25	A Yes.

1	I didn't really focus on whether
2	securities lending had been part of that
3	because it wasn't a qualification issue, and
4	my role in doing this was to evaluate the
5	plan from a qualification perspective.
6	But they very well could have been.
7	Q Now, where there is securities
8	lending, that's that gives rise where a
9	plan has investment earnings from
10	debt-financed activities, that gives rise to
11	unrelated business taxable income.
12	Isn't that right?
13	MR. MULLEN: Objection.
14	A I have thoughts on that. First,
15	it's called "debt-financed income," which is
16	a subset of unrelated business taxable
17	income. But it's in its own category.
18	Secondly, I didn't really look at
19	the transactions. I didn't I didn't look
20	to see if the plan was lending or if the plan
21	was borrowing. And so I didn't make a
22	determination on that.
23	You have to borrow money to make
24	money in order to have financed income, and I
25	didn't really study the transactions that

1	way.
2	Q Did you focus on whether, in fact,
3	the RJM plan was borrowing money?
4	A No.
5	Q Did you go did you focus on
6	whether the RJM plan had debt-financed
7	income?
8	A No. That wasn't that was
9	outside my focus on the plan's qualification.
10	Q Where a plan had very substantial
11	borrowings and very substantial debt-financed
12	income, would you expect that to be something
13	that would be the subject of an inquiry in
14	the course of an IRS audit?
15	MR. MULLEN: Objection.
16	MR. DILLMAN: Objection as to form.
17	A A plan borrowed money to make
18	investments and made a profit on that
19	investment. The IRS agent would likely say
20	that the plan should file an income tax
21	return and pay income taxes on that part of
22	the of the you know, on those
23	investment related to those investments,
24	to the DFI related to those investments.
25	That's yes, I would think that

1	an IRS agent would raise that issue.
2	Q And did you see any evidence of the
3	IRS agent here raising that?
4	A No. I like I said earlier, I
5	just don't know what information was given to
6	the agent on that. I don't fully understand
7	whether it's lending or borrowing, so I'm
8	not I don't have the background to
9	determine whether or not it is DFI. That's
10	debt-financed income, DFI.
11	MR. MULLEN: Bill, when you hit a
12	good spot, I think we've been at it for
13	about an hour and 15 minutes.
14	MR. MAGUIRE: Yeah, just in a
15	couple of minutes, we'll find a good
16	spot, Sean.
17	Q Sir, do you have any understanding
18	as to why the IRS agent did not raise this
19	issue of debt-financed income in the course
20	of the audit of the RJM plan?
21	MR. BAHNSON: Objection to form, no
22	foundation.
23	A I don't know that the IRS agent
24	didn't raise it. I mean, all I have is what
25	I have.